



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

"If at any time before the construction authorized by this act shall have been contracted for there shall have been established, with the co-operation of the United States of America, an international tribunal or tribunals competent to secure peaceful determinations of all international disputes, and which shall render unnecessary the maintenance of competitive armaments, then and in that case such naval expenditures as may be inconsistent with the engagements made in the establishment of such tribunal or tribunals may be suspended, when so ordered by the President of the United States."

FRATRICIDAL MADNESS

WE ARE wont to think of the Allies and the Central Powers as two foes struggling to maintain conflicting ideals, and are apt to extend our sympathies to the one side or the other as these vital ideals, as we see them, seem to oppose or coincide with our own. In the main this is a grave error. By so deceiving ourselves we not only miss what is the deepest and most disquieting fact of the present war, but we also allow our emotions to be misled and permit ourselves to be more and more confused. The great pathos of the war lies in the fact that the two armies of Europe, like an encampment alarmed at midnight and thrown into blind confusion, are flying at each other's throats not for conflicting ideals, but for the same ideals. In terms of idealism—the most sacred standard for which mankind can contend—it is not merely a struggle of right against wrong, but in a large sense a war of brethren, of followers of the same high standard, of heroes who are bravely dying and slaying for the same great principles, which should unite them and which in the past have united them with bonds of steel. It is a blind scramble in the dark, a slaughter of friends and co-idealists, permitted to prolong its horror and unnatural madness through the misunderstandings and muddled thinking in which it was initiated. "Right" is on both sides; "wrong" is on both sides.

One who attempts to paint the madness of the present war begins a measureless task. The millions of boys, many of them fine, most of them heroic, who have been cut down and are now rotting in or on the fields of Europe, present a picture of an infinite pathos. The blighted homes search out our deepest feelings. The wealth and the non-economic values that are gone—these enter into the tragedy.

But there is yet a more frenzied wildness in it all. We in this country are especially aware of the elements of idealism at the basis of the effort of the Allied Powers. England, for example, holds this war to be a war of right against wrong, and believes naturally that England is wholly on the side of the right. It is inconceivable to her to yield her demands for Belgium, the Bal-

kans, or northern France. She believes in the effectiveness of might, and frankly says so in terms of a mighty navy; but she does not propose to yield Europe to "the menace of militarism." She is keenly aware that she has a navy and resources over the seas, and she feels that by means of these it is her duty to uphold her "national honor" and "world responsibility." She believes that the principles of "freedom" and "justice" are now vitally at stake. She is sorry about our mails and the interference with neutral trade; but she calls attention to the fact that she is carrying the heavy end of the job, and she can't understand why we should be so particular. She insists that she is pursuing the goal of "true nationalism," and that there must be some "guarantee that this thing shall not happen again." If the English mind does not stop here, if it goes on in terms of self-defensive argument to censor ideas and to curtail freedom of expression, it is all aimed, as she believes, against evil ideas and wrongful utterance. She pleads for and is bleeding for the "free development of racial units" and for "a peace founded upon justice."

The pathetic madness about all this is that the Central Powers are pleading for essentially the same things and often in the same language. True, both sides are under grave suspicion because of a certain equivocal quality in their profession, and these equivocal professions, due to a certain vagueness, promote and prolong the war. Recriminations follow in natural sequence and intensity.

If an average American audience were asked if it has been England's desire for power, consuming jealousy, and limitless cravings for the riches of the world that have produced practically all of the European wars, the answer would be, No; but the Germans believe the answer should be, Yes. Has England been guilty of countless political intrigues, decapitating every prosperous European State, and mercilessly destroying the sea-power of every possible competitor? The Germans would say, Yes. Did the British Empire rob the Spanish treasuries? Did she rob Canada and the "States" from the French, Gibraltar from the Spaniards, India from the French and Portuguese, South Africa from the Dutch, Egypt and Cyprus from the Turks, Malta from the Italians? The Germans say, Yes. Who gave Morocco to the sword of France, Tripoli to the sword of Italy, and who would give Constantinople to the sword of Russia? England. Where in all the world are so many broken treaties and scraps of paper as in Downing street? Who would fix the clutch of Russia upon mid-Europe, of Japan upon China and the Pacific? By whom was opium forced upon China and the world, debasing human beings for gold? Germany's answer to all these is, England.

For these reasons the Germans believe that England is

greedy and grossly hypocritical, posing as a liberator, while acting the part of what Count Ernst zu Reventlow calls, with characteristic ferocity, a "vampire" clutching constantly at the heart of Europe. Germany has denied to England physical courage, honesty, endurance, organization, and assumes herself therefore the rôle of releasing the world from the clutches of the British "parasite." Germany agrees that this war is a struggle between light and darkness, but believes that she, Germany, is on the side of the light. In fighting for her own existence she claims to be fighting also for "the liberation of the world."

Of course, English opinion denies, and honestly enough, these charges by Germany. It goes further and insists that the present war was "not forced upon Germany, but forced by Germany upon Europe, and that it is the Allies who must have guarantees for future peace." This is the language of Viscount Grey on the twenty-third of last October. The Allies have convinced themselves that the German Government has been fashioned for the junkers and imperialists of that nation, and that its main policy, especially since 1871, has been simply a policy of conquest. This aggressive Kultur has succeeded in deceiving not only the people of Germany but the Reichstag. Everything that has happened since the war began is an illustration of the ruthless spirit of the German war-party. Beginning with the violation of Belgium and Luxemburg, the wild leaders introduced the use of poisonous gases, the bombardment of unfortified towns, the unlawful destruction of commerce; they have sunk the *Lusitania* and the *Sussex*, and they have resorted to pillage, tribute, and the barbarous exportation of natives out of Belgium into Germany. Germany is an absolutism, with all the evils that go with absolutism. These are some of the recriminating charges made by England against Germany. Indeed, they are in substance the charges made by Dr. Carl Liebknecht himself before the Committee of the Reichstag last spring, for which charges he was sentenced late in June to thirty months' imprisonment and dismissed from the army for high treason.

But if we squeeze these recriminations out of the words of the opposing nations and examine the constructive principles for which each contends that it is fighting, we find them to be in the main anti-militarism and freedom from aggression from the outside. Both sides are opposed to war and would that it may never again be necessary. Both sides, if we may interpret by means of the language of Viscount Grey and Chancellor von Bethmann Hollweg, are ready to join a league of nations in the interest of free States, large and small, and of a permanent peace. In short, we have two blood-related groups of nations ferociously at war with each other, each claiming to be pursuing essentially the same ideals,

and each longing for peace, but unable to attain it. Such an *impasse* tends to continue indefinitely the horrors of the struggle. The growing hatreds increase the misunderstandings and lack of comprehension. In his "Politics," Aristotle quotes a saying current in his day and pertinent to this day:

"Cruel the wars of brethren are";

and this:

"Those who have greatly loved do greatly hate."

The utter absence of anything like mutual sympathy, the rampant feelings of self-righteousness and of national pride, the rhetorical Kiplingisms and Bernhardisms—these are symptoms of the pathetic madness of the present world situation. But that this whole disaster is produced by the avoidable clash of two civilized groups professing the same ideals—words cannot convey the pathos of that.

WHAT WE MAY DO NOW FOR PEACE

THE signs of the approaching end of the war, while neither many nor bright, are increasing in number and more hopeful. Germany's demands were simplified by Chancellor von Bethmann Hollweg, November 29, when he announced that Germany was ready to end the war by a peace guaranteeing the existence and future of the nation. There is nothing inconsistent between this statement and the statement of the former British Prime Minister that the peace when it comes "must be such as will be built upon a sure and stable foundation—the security of the weak, the liberties of Europe, the free future of the world."

Hon. Charles P. Trevelyan, member of the British House of Commons, writes: "My countrymen are heartily sick of war. If once it were brought to the consciousness of ordinary Englishmen that Germany was ready for a reasonable peace, a rapid and radical change would appear in popular opinion." Since it is going to be extremely difficult to convince the world of the ethical difference between the military domination of Prussia and the military domination of the English navy, the time of the ultimate rapprochement should be rapidly drawing nearer. This view is reflected in the changing editorial emphasis of papers like the *New York Times*. It is expressed in a remarkable series of *Times* articles, signed by "Cosmos," reminding one of the "Federalist," penned by Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, in those crucial days when our Constitution hung in the balance. There is a growing number who believe that the psychological moment for some definite action is now or soon will be at hand. It is of importance, therefore, that we ask again and answer as best we may the question, What can we do now?